

EMAIL KORESPONDENSI DAN RESPON DAN PERBAIKAN YANG DILAKUKAN

**Environmental Hazards
Taylor and Francis**

Judul:

Collaboration and disaster: critical responses after tsunami events in Indonesia

From: Environmental Hazards <onbehalf@manuscriptcentral.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2020 6:11 AM
To: Samson, Maxim
Subject: [EXT] Environmental Hazards - Decision on Manuscript ID 20EHAZ979-RA

25-Jun-2020

Dear Dr. Samson:

Manuscript ID 20EHAZ979-RA entitled "Collaboration in the Face of Disaster: The Responses of Local Government, Adat and Religious Authorities to Tsunami Events in South Lampung" which you submitted to 'Environmental Hazards', has been reviewed.

I have read the reviewers' comments on your interesting paper and in general they are supportive but one is quite critical. The comments of the reviewers are included at the bottom of this letter and in the accompanying file (please make sure you get this).

This paper needs more work. The competition to publish in 'Environmental Hazards' is considerable, and growing all the time, and only papers of a very high standard can be published.

If you can adjust the paper to meet the reviewers' comments, or refute them, then I will consider a decision to publish.

Please:

- Reply to this e-mail to indicate its receipt.
- Provide a revised version by 30-Jul-2020 (i.e. within five weeks).
- Provide a FULL point-by-point list of changes/refutations against the reviewers' points.

To revise your manuscript, log into <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/ehaz> and enter your Author Centre, where you will find your manuscript title listed under "Manuscripts with Decisions." Under "Actions," click on "Create a Revision." Your manuscript number has been appended to denote a revision.

You may also click the below link to start the revision process (or continue the process if you have already started your revision) for your manuscript. If you use the below link you will not be required to login to ScholarOne Manuscripts.

*** PLEASE NOTE: This is a two-step process. After clicking on the link, you will be directed to a webpage to confirm. ***

https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/ehaz?URL_MASK=0e15121762d1465d8487796e9df7570e

You will be unable to make your revisions on the originally submitted version of the manuscript. Instead, revise your manuscript using a word processing program and save it on your computer. You are welcome to highlight the changes to your manuscript within the document by using the track changes mode in MS Word or by using bold or coloured text.

Once the revised manuscript is prepared, you can upload it and submit it through your Author Centre.

When submitting your revised manuscript, you will be able to respond to the comments made by the reviewer(s) in the space provided. You can use this space to document any changes you make to the original manuscript. In order to expedite the processing of the revised manuscript, please be as specific as possible in your response to the reviewer(s).

IMPORTANT: Your original files are available to you when you upload your revised manuscript. Please delete any redundant files before completing the submission.

Because we are trying to facilitate timely publication of manuscripts submitted to 'Environmental Hazards', your revised manuscript should be uploaded within six weeks. If it is not possible for you to submit your revision in a reasonable amount of time, we may have to consider your paper as a new submission.

I look forward to hearing from you and hope that we might be able to publish your paper in 'Environmental Hazards'.

Kind regards,

Professor Edmund Penning-Rowsell PhD OBE
7, Richmond Rd, Oxford OX1 2JJ. Tel: 01865 556 756
Member: Flood Hazard Research Centre [www.fhrc.mdx.ac.uk]
Research Associate: Oxford Centre for Water Research [ocwr.ouce.ox.ac.uk]
Editor: 'Environmental Hazards'

Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:

Reviewer: 1

Comments to the Author
Kindly find an attached document.

Reviewer: 2

Comments to the Author
Overview:

This paper explores the government and community response to the 2018 Sunda Strait tsunami in Indonesia using interviews with various stakeholders. The authors' analysis shows a lack of coordination between government, community, and religious groups in aiding the victims, and the authors propose a model for future interaction between groups to facilitate collaboration.

Review:

The manuscript is well-written and informative and focuses on a topic of disaster response in traditional societies that is worthy of exploration. The choice of study area is well-suited for examining the role of local actors in disaster response, due to the decentralized nature of

governing in Indonesia. The authors make good use of the model of collaborative governance laid out by Ansell and Gash and apply it as a framework for increasing collaboration among local stakeholders in the study area.

The local government is seen as both the source of the chaotic and uneven response to the disaster and the catalyst for change. The authors identify the role of local government as (1) initiating the disaster response, (2) responding quickly and efficiently with distribution of aid, (3) coordinating local groups' responses, and (4) providing material resources such as shelter, water, food, and first aid. The authors also highlight a unique role of government, which is to facilitate equitable distribution of services and to ensure that marginalized populations are not left out of the recovery. Local government standard operating procedures seem to be key in getting the process started and sustaining it.

I would have liked to see more information on “the nightly meetings to which his and other organisations were invited at the height of the response process” (page 20, line 15) and referenced again on page 21, line 17, “the government’s creation of a forum and the involvement of non-state actors.” The forum and involvement of non-state actors were 2 of the 6 criteria but received only a brief comment. When was the forum created and what did it accomplish? It sounds like there were attempts to create collaboration, but were they handled ineffectively? Were the non-state stakeholders given only an advisory capacity? This is the only place in the manuscript where I was hoping for more information.

...

FROM REVIEWER 1

Title of Manuscript: Collaboration in the Face of Disaster: The responses of Local Government, Adat and Religious Authorities to Tsunami Events in South Lampung.

1. Is the manuscript within the scope of a journal?

This paper contributes ways of improving standards of living, and the human condition generally, by examining potential solutions to problems and also highlight the lessons to be learned from the experiences.

2. Is it a new and original contribution to the research literature?

This paper is a new and original contribution to the research literature.

3. Does the manuscript indicate an awareness of other research on this topic?

The contents are very new for readers.

4. Is the manuscript of relevance to an international audience?

This manuscript is relevant to an international audience.

5. Does the TITLE clearly reflect the contents of the manuscript?

The title can be changed. The general comments can be referred.

6. Is the ABSTRACT sufficiently informative, especially if read in isolation?

The abstract is sufficiently informative.

7. Are the KEYWORDS informative?

The keywords seem not appropriate to what the authors want to argue in this manuscript. It isn't easy to imagine the contents by the keywords.

8. Have the OBJECTIVES been adequately stated? Are they appropriate?

Stated but should be polished.

The objectives have been stated. Broader perspectives are expected, such as how we can apply this model to mitigate tsunami disasters in general e.g. other cases.

9. Does the INTRODUCTION introduce the topic adequately, as well as its research context and relevance?

The introduction introduces the topic adequately. The whole view can be grasped.

10. Are the METHODS correctly described and sufficiently detailed to allow replication of the research?

The methods are described and understandable.

11. Is the presentation of RESULTS adequate?

The results are shown. It seems a bit difficult to follow. I recommend the authors to use tables (the summary of the results) for readers to understand the results more clearly.

Readers want to have a whole picture, such as figures and tables to read the narrative

descriptions more easily.

12. Does the DISCUSSION adequately relate the findings of the research?

There is no discussion part but the need for collaboration instead. This seems the most significant part. This part is related to the findings.

13. Are the Conclusions justified by the data (if an empirical study) or the evidence presented?

The conclusions justified by the evidences.

14. Are all the Figures and Tables necessary and/or sufficiently informative?

More Figures or Tables, especially in the result section, are desirable for readers to understand the manuscript more easily.

15. Can you make any suggestions that may improve the value of this manuscript?

These are explained in the below general comments.

ANY GENERAL COMMENTS:

Total views:

1. Can you prove the effectiveness of the model?

Please mention the limitations of this viewpoint.

2. Does the paper only contribute to the target society?

I was wondering if the authors could explain your paper's potential contributions such as the model or methodology to other cases more clearly. Only the "likely that similar dynamics are true in other Southeast Asian countries" seems not enough.

Contents:

1. The paper focuses on the disaster recovery process. Therefore, it leads to misunderstandings of the readers about the manuscript by the title.

2. It is common for disaster (emergency) management related practitioners and researchers about the following keys; 1) sharing the same information (intelligence), COP (common operational picture), and 2) collaborating among related agencies.

3. The paper mentions only focusing on the recovery process. I was confused because of this. The collaboration among related organizations is crucial for disaster management, especially disaster response phase with others such as preparedness, mitigation(prevention), and recovery.

4. How about the central government? Even if the local government is the key, the relationship between local and central governments can be expressed more. It could be up to the magnitude of the disaster. Usually, countries have a disaster response plan and system such as NRP(National Response Plan) and ICS(Incident Command System) in the U.S. Normally, the magnitude of disaster determines the related response bodies such as community, municipality, state(prefecture), or national levels. A large-scale disaster can

have all levels. However, the local government always plays a key role as ICS and other countries' disaster response system show. These could be examined.

5. How are country, local, and culturally specific contexts influence collaboration?

6. How do you think of a successful disaster recovery?

This is necessary to show the readers to indicate the model's usefulness. There is a need to clarify what successful recovery is and why and how collaboration is critical more with including other literature's examinations.

From: Edmund Penning-Rowsell <edmund@penningrowsell.com>
Sent: Monday, June 29, 2020 3:05 AM
To: Samson, Maxim
Subject: [EXT] Paper 979

Dear Max

Here are my thoughts. The reviewer was not very clear.

A typology of collaboration types would be useful (towards the start) , and the suggestions for lessons for other countries and other disasters (towards the end). Other things can be considered or ignored.

Do not worry if you exceed the word limit by a (small) few hundred words

Kind regards

Edmund

Prof. Edmund Penning-Rowsell PhD OBE
7 Richmond Road Oxford OX1 2JJ
01865 556 756 Mobile 07367 102 715
Skype: edmundpenning-rowsell
Member: Flood Hazard Research Centre <http://www.fhrc.mdx.ac.uk> @FHRC_MDX
Member: Oxford Water Security Network www.water.ox.ac.uk
Editor: Environmental Hazards (Taylor and Francis) <http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/ehaz>

From: Environmental Hazards <onbehalfof@manuscriptcentral.com>

Sent: Friday, August 14, 2020 2:40 AM

To: Samson, Maxim

Subject: [EXT] Environmental Hazards - Decision on Manuscript ID 20EHAZ979-RA.R1

14-Aug-2020

Dear Dr. Samson:

This paper, entitled Collaboration in the Face of Disaster: The Responses of Local Government, Adat and Religious Authorities to Tsunami Events in South Lampung is now accepted. I am not sure when it will be published, but it should be early 2022 at the latest. A published electronic version of the paper will be available very much earlier than this.

In due course you will receive proofs to correct.

Thank you for submitting this paper, which will be a valuable contribution to 'Environmental Hazards'.

Kind regards,

Professor Edmund Penning-Rowsell PhD OBE

7, Richmond Rd, Oxford OX1 2JJ. Tel: 01865 556 756

Member: Flood Hazard Research Centre [www.fhrc.mdx.ac.uk]

Research Associate: Oxford Centre for Water Research [ocwr.ouce.ox.ac.uk]

Editor: 'Environmental Hazards'

Dear Professor Penning-Rowsell,

Many thanks for your helpful advice regarding how best to proceed with the reviewers' suggestions. We appreciate the time you and the reviewers have spent to consider our manuscript and have sought to make the necessary amendments. If there is anything else we can add, develop or change so that our manuscript can be accepted for publication, please do not hesitate to let us know.

Many thanks,

Arizka Warganegara and Max Samson

Reviewer	Row	Suggestion	Response/amendment
1	1	Point 5/Content 1: Consider changing the title to better address the disaster recovery process.	Thank you to the editor for stating that we do not need to do this. We did consider rephrasing the title, mainly because we agree with the reviewer that “response” and “recovery” should be more carefully distinguished, but ultimately felt that “response” is indeed what we are discussing and so the title is appropriate. Instead, we have made some small changes throughout the manuscript to ensure that “response” and “recovery” do not get misconstrued by a reader.
	2	Point 7: Consider changing the keywords	In line with the above, we respectfully disagree, as these words are all used repeatedly in the manuscript and are specific to our paper. Arguably “custom community” is the most uncommon of our terms, but we feel this is more internationally understandable than the Indonesian word “adat” and thus more appropriate as a keyword. We found that we cannot add a sixth keyword through the submission system; our suggestion would have been “Indonesia”.
	3	Point 8: The objectives	Thank you for these suggestions. We believe that the contributions and research questions are clearly stated, such as:

	<p>have been stated but should be polished by drawing on broader perspectives, such as how we can apply this model to mitigate tsunami disasters in general e.g. other cases /</p> <p>Total view 2: Clarify the paper's potential contributions, such as how the model or methodology could be used for other cases. What lessons can be learnt for</p>	<p><i>With regard to the 2018 Sunda Strait tsunami, we argue that the lack of coordination among the three key groups involved in the disaster response phase – specifically local government, customary community or adat leaders and religious institutions – resulted in a slow and inadequate process. To this end, we create a model that can be used to facilitate collaboration between these three groups in order to improve post-tsunami disaster response in South Lampung and other at-risk areas.</i></p> <p><i>An emphasis on collaboration in post-tsunami response is essential for several reasons. First, although there is abundant literature on post-tsunami disaster response (see e.g. Hutanuwa et al., 2013; Moshtari & Gonçalves, 2017), few studies have sought to construct a model of collaboration that might be used to identify its dynamics with a view to increasing its efficacy. One valuable exception is Martin et al.'s (2016) classification of the "Four Cs" of disaster partnering: communication, cooperation, coordination and collaboration. Martin et al. (2016, p. 638) argue that these activities are distinct, constituting a "continuum of interorganisational embeddedness", with individual organisations demonstrating differing levels of ability in each, necessitating partnership. Significantly, the authors present collaboration as the most challenging enterprise, requiring that each participating organisation align its efforts with its counterparts, a time-consuming and resource-intensive task, but one that has received less attention than coordination in particular (Martin et al., 2016). In response, our paper is centred on collaboration, and in contrast to Martin et al.'s broader focus on international organisations' engagement in disaster partnering, we accentuate the important role played by domestic actors, groups that these authors recognise are often regarded as difficult to integrate into the overall response. Indeed, collaboration may be constrained by a range of contextual, interorganisational and inner-organisational factors (Moshtari & Gonçalves, 2017), complicated further by the diversity of organisations that suddenly appear in the field (Parmar et al., 2017). Any model of collaboration must therefore be adaptable and consider the assets each actor can offer.</i></p> <p><i>Through combining Ansell and Gash's (2008) theoretical model of collaborative governance with our own empirical results from the 2018 Sunda Strait tsunami, we have created a model that can be used to inspire collaboration between three of the most important types of domestic actors in Indonesia: local government, adat and religious institutions. Through investigating the role played by each in responding to this disaster, alongside the social and technical issues encountered, we have identified the assets that the three groups can</i></p>
--	---	---

		<p>other countries? (We are combining these as they seem to be closely related.)</p> <p><i>offer. It is crucial that local governments familiarise themselves with their non-government counterparts' resources – and enthusiasm for engagement – when preparing their post-tsunami response. Indeed, these groups can offset local governments' potential limitations such as community trust and de facto authority through their sensitivity to local needs and, especially in the case of major religious institutions, intra- and international partnerships and networks, bringing material as well as human resources.</i></p> <p>Plus the model itself, of course.</p> <p>Nevertheless, we have opted to add the following to clarify our contributions and what can be learnt, as well as to demonstrate the wider relevance of the model and this issue in general:</p> <p><i>Indonesia as a whole shares certain important commonalities with other Southeast Asian countries like Malaysia, the Philippines and Thailand, from the varied social and environmental impacts of rapid economic development and industrialisation, including the growth of commercial tourism (Resurreccion, Sajor, & Fajber, 2008), to the continued importance of religion in society (Liow, 2016) as well as the vulnerability of much of its population to tsunami hazards (Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery, 2017). Consequently, Lampung offers an appropriate case study for the development of a collaborative model of post-tsunami response that can be applied in other parts of the region that are similarly prone to tsunami events and whose economies and societies have analogous characteristics.</i></p> <p><i>We believe that successful disaster response relies on all six criteria, as non-state actors must be empowered to contribute to the formulation of a strategy. Even if the government remains in control of realising it, the procedure will enjoy greater legitimacy and buy-in from various groups, which can play a more active role in advancing disaster management from response to recovery as a result. To this end and through refining the original model conceptualised by Ansell and Gash (2008, p. 550), in Figure 2 we propose a new model of collaboration that highlights the assets that each of the three groups can offer in order to negotiate the post-tsunami disaster process in the future.</i></p> <p><i>Nevertheless, our model is flexible enough to be adapted, for example through recognising that religious actors (among others) are often involved but somewhat marginalised in humanitarian work (Ager & Ager, 2015; Bush</i></p>
--	--	---

		<p><i>et al., 2015; Tomalin, 2020) and that governments may be unwilling or even unable to establish the conditions for meaningful collaboration (Hutanuwatr et al., 2013; Martin et al., 2016). Indeed, rather than dictating what disaster response should comprise – as this is clearly impossible – we hope that our model will provide a useful frame for collaboration that identifies the main roles played by key actors in disaster response and that can be refashioned to different disaster contexts as necessary. Crucially, given its rooting in Ansell and Gash’s model, which these authors developed through an international, meta-analytical study reviewing “137 studies of collaborative governance across a range of policy sectors” (2008, p. 561), our model draws on a strong body of evidence and recommendations for effective collaboration and good governance from across the globe. Considering the significant threat posed by tsunamis in many (especially low- and middle-income) countries and the resultant need to engage as many communal resources as possible, such a model that facilitates the participation and collaboration of different non-state as well as state actors in a succinct manner is essential (see Martin et al., 2016). Studies by researchers in different parts of the world are now necessary to ascertain the effectiveness of our model in its current form, its consideration of the key areas where collaboration may not be realised and its potential to activate the resources of formerly overlooked actors to support those in need.</i></p> <p>Moreover, the newly named Discussion section now refers to how the model has been developed in the specific context of Indonesia but may easily be adapted to other contexts. This addition also refers to our model’s strength, being rooted in Ansell and Gash’s rigorous scholarship regarding collaborative governance, and is linked more explicitly above to Martin et al.’s definition of collaboration in disaster contexts, which they develop based on previous relevant research. (We have noted in our minds that our model is about disaster response and not mitigation as claimed by the reviewer, but do not feel it is worth distinguishing the two because it may lead to confusion in the paper):</p> <p><i>Moreover, adat communities are specific to Indonesia and the country’s political system – including the place of religious actors within it – is necessarily unique, constraining the immediate generalisability of our model and indeed any other. Nevertheless, our model is flexible enough to be adapted, for example through recognising that religious actors (among others) are often involved but somewhat marginalised in humanitarian work (Ager & Ager, 2015; Bush et al., 2015; Tomalin, 2020) and that governments may be unwilling or even unable to establish the conditions for meaningful collaboration (Hutanuwatr et al., 2013; Martin et al., 2016). Indeed, rather than dictating what disaster response should comprise – as this is clearly impossible – we hope that our</i></p>
--	--	--

		<p><i>model will provide a useful frame for collaboration that identifies the main roles played by key actors in disaster response and that can be refashioned to different disaster contexts as necessary. Crucially, given its rooting in Ansell and Gash's model, which these authors developed through an international, meta-analytical study reviewing "137 studies of collaborative governance across a range of policy sectors" (2008, p. 561), our model draws on a strong body of evidence and recommendations for effective collaboration and good governance from across the globe. Considering the significant threat posed by tsunamis in many (especially low- and middle-income) countries and the resultant need to engage as many communal resources as possible, such a model that facilitates the participation and collaboration of different non-state as well as state actors in a succinct manner is essential (see Martin et al., 2016). Studies by researchers in different parts of the world are now necessary to ascertain the effectiveness of our model in its current form, its consideration of the key areas where collaboration may not be realised and its potential to activate the resources of formerly overlooked actors to support those in need.</i></p> <p>Finally, the Conclusion now refers to some of the more common problems that can preclude collaboration in disaster response and how our model can stimulate researchers and stakeholders to attend to these. As a result, the wider relevance of our model can be ascertained:</p> <p><i>Researchers interested in applying this model to other contexts should be particularly attentive to instances of actors being constrained from collaborating, especially in cases where the government is nominally secular but non-state organisations have a religious affiliation, as this appears to be a fairly common concern in humanitarianism (see Tomalin, 2020), as attested to in this article. Furthermore, discerning meaningful collaboration from tokenist consultation is necessary to ensure that different groups are empowered to contribute to disaster response and to prevent government agents from operationalising a disaster for self-serving goals, especially where the political system in question is susceptible to partisanship. By sharing further empirical insights to the nexus between potential or real collaborators in other tsunami-prone contexts, there is scope to refine our model and to determine which of its components are specific to our context and which are more generalisable. Most importantly, we hope that by doing so, more community actors will feel empowered to support post-tsunami response and that as many lives and livelihoods can be protected as possible.</i></p>
--	--	--

			Please see in row 10 our argument for how our model helps us understand collaborative governance. We will not repeat it here for the sake of succinctness.
	4	Point 11/14: Add more results tables/figures so that readers can more readily understand the results.	As we have noted in a separate email, we are sceptical about the idea of including a new table to present the results as it would seem a little unconventional for a qualitative, interview-based study requiring as much space as possible for critical, contemplative thinking. In addition, the current Table 1 already articulates many of our key findings, so a second table seems to us at least a little redundant and limiting. Thank you to the editor for considering this concern and for noting that the other reviewer did not have difficulty understanding the results. Therefore, we have opted against adding more tables/figures.
	5	Total view 1: Prove the effectiveness of the model and mention its limitations.	<p>Regarding proof, given that this model has been developed based on the findings of our research, we do not believe that the present study intends to prove it at this stage: the order would seem to be the other way around. We hope that in future research we can prove its effectiveness, most likely focusing on another or several other recent examples of tsunami disasters, but this is something for a second study. We hope you agree.</p> <p>We agree that the limitations are worth stating:</p> <p><i>At the same time, it is essential to recognise that the model is not intended as a one-size-fits-all approach, as all disaster response strategies should be contextually specific (Bush et al., 2015). For the purposes of clarity, it is inevitably a simplification of a complex issue. Moreover, adat communities are specific to Indonesia and the country's political system – including the place of religious actors within it – is necessarily unique, constraining the immediate generalisability of our model and indeed any other.</i></p>
	6	Content 2: It is common for disaster (emergency) management related	<p>This is certainly true in advanced democratic countries with effective and efficient governance. However, Indonesia is a complex case where the patronage practice causes both central and local government to be trapped in vested internal interests. We have accounted for this by adding:</p> <p><i>Decentralisation since early 2000 has affected relations between the central and local government, with governance now characterised by “varying degrees of development, including local egoism and institutional</i></p>

	<p>practitioners and researchers about the following keys; 1) sharing the same information (intelligence), COP (common operational picture), and 2) collaborating among related agencies. Have you defined collaboration sufficiently, and its typologies? This warrants further attention.</p>	<p><i>fragmentation” (Holzhacker, Wittek, & Wolter, 2016, p. 6) and political partisanship often resulting in conflicting interests. For instance, when responding to tsunami events, the central government disaster agency Badan Nasional Penanggulangan Bencana (BNPB) is supposed to work closely with the district disaster management agency (BPBD), but their coordination can easily be undermined by the incompatible political goals of local and central government leaders.</i></p> <p><i>Indeed, a major limitation of these meetings was that rather than constituting part of a formal disaster management system, they represented mere informal discussions between representatives of the local government and non-state actors like NU and Muhammadiyah, operationalised by the former to gain the latter’s support. The fact that “no significant decision was made” despite there being a meeting “almost every night...after Isha prayer” (NU) reflected the lack of genuine attempt made by the local government to elicit alternative views. Although such governance is fairly typical in Indonesia, where democracy is rooted in patronage and informal politics is important (Aspinall & Berenschot, 2019), it risks rendering organisations like the religious actors here largely powerless as potential collaborators.</i></p> <p>Note that we have also already discussed the relationship between local and central government through reference to the decentralisation policy of 2000. We refer further to the relationship between local and central government in row 8.</p> <p>We have also added definitions of governance and collaboration and used them to clarify the type of collaborative governance we are advocating:</p> <p><i>Fukuyama characterises governance as “a government’s ability to make and enforce rules, and to deliver services” (2013, p. 350), while building on previous research from disaster contexts, Martin et al. describe collaboration as “a long-term relationship between organisations, characterised by high levels of interdependency and high risk, which requires significant power symmetry” (2016, p. 625). Synthesising these definitions with the various governance systems or modes identified by Duit and Galaz (2008) and Bednar and Henstra (2018) as well as the findings presented above, we believe that the key traits that need to be incorporated within a collaborative model of post-tsunami response are the following:</i></p>
--	---	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Flexibility, enabling actors to react and adapt to rapidly changing and sometimes unpredictable circumstances, potentially for an extended period, without being constrained by institutional bureaucracy; and</i> • <i>Egalitarianism, recognising that local communities are most familiar with their environments and their associated risks and should thus be intimately involved in decision-making processes that profoundly affect their lives.</i> <p><i>We emphasise these attributes because our research has shown that the lack of collaboration among the three types of institutions (local government, adat and religious institutions) largely owed to the local government's inability to act as a catalyst, overlooking the potential of the other actors to contribute even though the religious groups in particular responded rapidly to the disaster situation.</i></p> <p>This builds on the section on Ansell and Gash's model already in the manuscript:</p> <p><i>We emphasise these attributes because our research has shown that the lack of collaboration among the three types of institutions (local government, adat and religious institutions), which largely owed to the inability of the local government to act as a catalyst, resulted in inefficient attempts to tackle the impacts of the 2018 Sunda Strait tsunami. Only the first two of Ansell and Gash's (2008, p. 544–545) six criteria of collaborative governance were readily apparent: the government's creation of a forum and the involvement of non-state actors. By contrast, the other criteria were extremely limited: little formal dialogue occurred among the different actors involved and the local government was criticised for failing to engage the other stakeholders and to initiate and coordinate the necessary actions (3, 4). As a result, the disaster response was much less characterised by consensus (5) than by an overlapping or duplication of actions, with each group working largely individually, rendering it likely that some victims were neglected while others received disproportionate attention depending on their centrality within each group's networks. Given the general shortage of human resources and pre-emptive disaster management policies, chaos ensued as each group separately attempted to manage and provide proper assistance to victims, hardly conducive to effective public policy or management (6). Table 1 presents a qualitative analysis of the practice of collaborative governance among the groups involved.</i></p> <p>Added to this:</p>
--	--	---

			<p><i>We believe that successful disaster response relies on all six criteria, as non-state actors must be empowered to contribute to the formulation of a strategy. Even if the government remains in control of realising it, the procedure will enjoy greater legitimacy and buy-in from various groups, which can play a more active role in advancing disaster management from response to recovery as a result. To this end and through refining the original model conceptualised by Ansell and Gash (2008, p. 550), in Figure 2 we propose a new model of collaboration that highlights the assets that each of the three groups can offer in order to negotiate the post-tsunami disaster process in the future.</i></p> <p>Regarding typologies, please see the penultimate row in response to the editor's suggestion.</p>
	7	<p>Content 3: The paper mentions only focusing on the recovery process, which the reviewer found confusing: "The collaboration among related organizations is crucial for disaster management, especially disaster</p>	<p>We agree with the editor's comment that we should not worry about this suggestion. Indeed, we believe that it would be unrealistic to consider all of these phases in this paper. Nevertheless, as mentioned above, we have now carefully checked to ensure that "recovery" and "response" are distinguished rather than risking conflation.</p>

		response phase with others such as preparedness, mitigation (prevention), and recovery”.	
	8	Content 4: Highlight and examine the role of central government in disaster response.	<p>We have added the following:</p> <p><i>Decentralisation since early 2000 has affected relations between the central and local government, with governance now characterised by “varying degrees of development, including local egoism and institutional fragmentation” (Holzhacker, Wittek, & Woltjer, 2016, p. 6) and political partisanship often resulting in conflicting interests. For instance, when responding to tsunami events, the central government disaster agency Badan Nasional Penanggulangan Bencana (BNPB) is supposed to work closely with the district disaster management agency (BPBD), but their coordination can easily be undermined by the incompatible political goals of local and central government leaders.</i></p> <p>Please see also these parts in the text:</p> <p><i>In addition, its regional autonomy, a result of the decentralisation policy initiated in 2000 through Law No. 22/1999, enables the local authority to govern based on local needs and interests. Consequently, formal government leaders such as the head of the regency (regent), local members of parliament and other officials assume a key role in dealing with disaster problems.</i></p> <p><i>Local government is central to the political process in the democratic era, especially since Indonesia’s political reforms of 1998. However, instead of merely relying on formal political institutions when dealing with natural disasters, adat communities also play a significant role in tending to people’s needs, especially since the central government replaced Village Law No. 5/1979 on village government with Law No. 22/1999 and Law No.</i></p>

			<p>6/2014. In Indonesian local politics today, these groups, which are widely perceived as holders of local traditions (Bubandt, 2014), are thus often mobilised by local government officials to garner political support and legitimacy for their candidacy.</p>
	9	<p>Content 5: Demonstrate how country-, local- and culturally specific context influences collaboration.</p>	<p>Thank you for this suggestion. In response, we have added the following:</p> <p><i>Indeed, even though the adat communities in this area are officially recognised by the local government, this does not extend to affording them a significant political role in local governance and as a result, their potential culturally specific contributions to the overall disaster management process risk being overlooked. Adding to the challenge here was the fact that some of the victims would bring their issues to their adat leader, not the local government, recognising that the former system has existed for much longer than the latter. Most of the victims' families have been living in this area for over one hundred years – some are even descendants of the victims of the 1883 Krakatau eruption – and so bringing issues to one's adat leader rather than one's government remains customary. Thus, despite their intimate knowledge of their communities' needs, values and contexts, groups such as adat were compelled to play an informal rather than genuinely active role in the relief process, being restricted in the decision-making process and lacking financial assistance, their work being largely limited to personal initiatives taken by some of their leaders in Kalianda and Rajabasa.</i></p> <p><i>Indeed, a major limitation of these meetings was that rather than constituting part of a formal disaster management system, they represented mere informal discussions between representatives of the local government and non-state actors like NU and Muhammadiyah, operationalised by the former to gain the latter's support. The fact that “no significant decision was made” despite there being a meeting “almost every night...after Isha prayer” (NU) reflected the lack of genuine attempt made by the local government to elicit alternative views. Although such governance is fairly typical in Indonesia, where democracy is rooted in patronage and informal politics is important (Aspinall & Berenschot, 2019), it risks rendering organisations like the religious actors here largely powerless as potential collaborators.</i></p> <p>We have also amended this part:</p>

			<p><i>Local government is central to the political process in the democratic era, especially since Indonesia's political reforms of 1998. However, instead of merely relying on formal political institutions when dealing with natural disasters, adat communities also play a significant role in tending to people's needs, especially since the central government replaced Village Law No. 5/1979 on village government with Law No. 22/1999 and Law No. 6/2014. In Indonesian local politics today, these groups, which are widely perceived as holders of local traditions (Bubandt, 2014), are thus often mobilised by local government officials to garner political support and legitimacy for their candidacy.</i></p>
	10	<p>Content 6: Clarify what successful disaster recovery is and why and how collaboration can be achieved, with reference to other literature.</p>	<p>We have added what we consider successful collaborative governance in post-tsunami response here:</p> <p><i>Fukuyama characterises governance as "a government's ability to make and enforce rules, and to deliver services" (2013, p. 350), while building on previous research from disaster contexts, Martin et al. describe collaboration as "a long-term relationship between organisations, characterised by high levels of interdependency and high risk, which requires significant power symmetry" (2016, p. 625). Synthesising these definitions with the various governance systems or modes identified by Duit and Galaz (2008) and Bednar and Henstra (2018) as well as the findings presented above, we believe that the key traits that need to be incorporated within a collaborative model of post-tsunami response are the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• Flexibility, enabling actors to react and adapt to rapidly changing and sometimes unpredictable circumstances, potentially for an extended period, without being constrained by institutional bureaucracy; and</i> <i>• Egalitarianism, recognising that local communities are most familiar with their environments and their associated risks and should thus be intimately involved in decision-making processes that profoundly affect their lives.</i> <p><i>We emphasise these attributes because our research has shown that the lack of collaboration among the three types of institutions (local government, adat and religious institutions) largely owed to the local government's inability to act as a catalyst, overlooking the potential of the other actors to contribute even though the religious groups in particular responded rapidly to the disaster situation.</i></p> <p>We have linked this addition to our existing discussion of Ansell and Gash's model, which we believe encapsulates our attention to collaboration in a disaster response context:</p>

		<p><i>Only the first two of Ansell and Gash's (2008, p. 544–545) six criteria of collaborative governance were readily apparent: the government's creation of a forum and the involvement of non-state actors. By contrast, the other criteria were extremely limited: little formal dialogue occurred among the different actors involved and the local government was criticised for failing to engage the other stakeholders and to initiate and coordinate the necessary actions (3, 4). As a result, the disaster response was much less characterised by consensus (5) than by an overlapping or duplication of actions, with each group working largely individually, rendering it likely that some victims were neglected while others received disproportionate attention depending on their centrality within each group's networks. Given the general shortage of human resources and pre-emptive disaster management policies, chaos ensued as each group separately attempted to manage and provide proper assistance to victims, hardly conducive to effective public policy or management (6).</i></p> <p>We have added to this further by developing the Discussion section:</p> <p><i>We believe that successful disaster response relies on all six criteria, as non-state actors must be empowered to contribute to the formulation of a strategy. Even if the government remains in control of realising it, the procedure will enjoy greater legitimacy and buy-in from various groups, which can play a more active role in advancing disaster management from response to recovery as a result. To this end and through refining the original model conceptualised by Ansell and Gash (2008, p. 550), in Figure 2 we propose a new model of collaboration that highlights the assets that each of the three groups can offer in order to negotiate the post-tsunami disaster process in the future.</i></p> <p>We feel that this segment covers how collaboration can be achieved, building on previous literature:</p> <p><i>We contend that the model is helpful because it can encourage the three groups to collaborate when responding to future tsunami events in contexts not limited to South Lampung. By considering all three types of actors together, our model draws on a wide network of resources and clearly identifies what each party brings to the table in order to increase community preparedness and accelerate post-disaster response (see McGeehan & Baker, 2017). Indeed, while local government possesses assets such as material resources and official political authority, adat and religious organisations can help through mediating with their communities and ensuring</i></p>
--	--	---

			<p><i>that plans are tailored to local needs, the latter potentially also attracting aid from abroad as well as from other parts of the same country through their networks (Joakim & White, 2015).</i></p> <p><i>In addition, our model enables the groups to compensate for the potential limitations of their counterparts. For instance, adat and religious actors are often trusted more than local government and thus possess considerable social capital (Joakim & White, 2015; McGeehan & Baker, 2017), whereas local governments may be able to intervene should certain (e.g. religious, ethnic, sexual) minorities become marginalised due to divisions within their collaborators (Balgos et al., 2012; Bush et al., 2015). Therefore, the model maximises the likelihood that as many members of society as possible are recognised.</i></p> <p>This part also demonstrates how we have thought carefully about our model, grounded in previous literature, and indicates the importance of collaboration in disaster response:</p> <p><i>Crucially, given its rooting in Ansell and Gash’s model, which these authors developed through an international, meta-analytical study reviewing “137 studies of collaborative governance across a range of policy sectors” (2008, p. 561), our model draws on a strong body of evidence and recommendations for effective collaboration and good governance from across the globe. Considering the significant threat posed by tsunamis in many (especially low- and middle-income) countries and the resultant need to engage as many communal resources as possible, such a model that facilitates the participation and collaboration of different non-state as well as state actors in a succinct manner is essential (see Martin et al., 2016).</i></p> <p>Finally, the importance of collaboration and the associated contributions made by our paper can be seen in our findings regarding the limitations of current disaster response in South Lampung, apparent throughout the Results section. We won’t expand on these here as we note in the email that you would like us to be as specific and concise as possible, but are happy to send some examples if requested.</p>
Editor	1	A typology of collaboration types would be useful (towards the	<p>An entire typology seems to us a little unrealistic for the scope of this paper, especially considering that typologies of notions such as governance are typically very expansive and we are only presenting one case study here. Moreover, we feel that our model and newly added definitions above cover what needs to be said. Nevertheless, the idea is something we will consider for a future paper, especially if we get the opportunity to incorporate other case studies (in the process testing out our model elsewhere). We hope you agree, but will endeavour to add one if it seems essential.</p>

		<p>start), and the suggestions for lessons for other countries and other disasters (towards the end)</p>	<p>We also hope that the new start to the Discussion section detailed above plus the table and the model cover everything that needs to be said about what we mean by collaborative governance and where our model fits.</p> <p>We have also added our lessons for other cases towards the end, as requested:</p> <p><i>Researchers interested in applying this model to other contexts should be particularly attentive to instances of actors being constrained from collaborating, especially in cases where the government is nominally secular but non-state organisations have a religious affiliation, as this appears to be a fairly common concern in humanitarianism (see Tomalin, 2020), as attested to in this article. Furthermore, discerning meaningful collaboration from tokenist consultation is necessary to ensure that different groups are empowered to contribute to disaster response and to prevent government agents from operationalising a disaster for self-serving goals, especially where the political system in question is susceptible to partisanship. By sharing further empirical insights to the nexus between potential or real collaborators in other tsunami-prone contexts, there is scope to refine our model and to determine which of its components are specific to our context and which are more generalisable.</i></p> <p>Finally, please see our segment in the Discussion on the value of the model:</p> <p><i>We contend that the model is helpful because it can encourage the three groups to collaborate when responding to future tsunami events in contexts not limited to South Lampung. By considering all three types of actors together, our model draws on a wide network of resources and clearly identifies what each party brings to the table in order to increase community preparedness and accelerate post-disaster response (see McGeehan & Baker, 2017). Indeed, while local government possesses assets such as material resources and official political authority, adat and religious organisations can help through mediating with their communities and ensuring that plans are tailored to local needs, the latter potentially also attracting aid from abroad as well as from other parts of the same country through their networks (Joakim & White, 2015).</i></p> <p><i>In addition, our model enables the groups to compensate for the potential limitations of their counterparts. For instance, adat and religious actors are often trusted more than local government and thus possess considerable social capital (Joakim & White, 2015; McGeehan & Baker, 2017), whereas local</i></p>
--	--	--	---

			governments may be able to intervene should certain (e.g. religious, ethnic, sexual) minorities become marginalised due to divisions within their collaborators (Balgos et al., 2012; Bush et al., 2015). Therefore, the model maximises the likelihood that as many members of society as possible are recognised.
2	1	Provide more information on the nightly meetings and forum: when was the forum created and what did it accomplish? Were efforts made to create collaboration but they were handled ineffectively? Were the non-state stakeholders given only an advisory capacity?	<p>We agree that this needed more attention and so have added the following:</p> <p><i>Indeed, a major limitation of these meetings was that rather than constituting part of a formal disaster management system, they represented mere informal discussions between representatives of the local government and non-state actors like NU and Muhammadiyah, operationalised by the former to gain the latter's support. The fact that "no significant decision was made" despite there being a meeting "almost every night...after Isha prayer" (NU) reflected the lack of genuine attempt made by the local government to elicit alternative views. Although such governance is fairly typical in Indonesia, where democracy is rooted in patronage and informal politics is important (Aspinall & Berenschot, 2019), it risks rendering organisations like the religious actors here largely powerless as potential collaborators.</i></p> <p>We also now nod to this point in the Conclusion:</p> <p><i>Furthermore, discerning meaningful collaboration from tokenist consultation is necessary to ensure that different groups are empowered to contribute to disaster response and to prevent government agents from operationalising a disaster for self-serving goals, especially where the political system in question is susceptible to partisanship.</i></p>

